



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,256	11/17/2003	Hiroyuki Hagihara	Q64625	4774
23373	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			LE, HOA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,256

Applicant(s)

HAGIHARA ET AL

Examiner

H. T. Le

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Nov. '03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 2-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishida et al (US 6,660,380).

Claim 2: Ishida et al teach a zinc oxide, the surface of which is coated with a metallic soap (col. 12, lines 1-10). Ishida does not teach the method of forming of the coating. However, claim 2 is a product-by-process claim; therefore, as long as all the product limitations are met, in this case, zinc oxide particles coated with a metallic soap, the burden is on the Applicants to prove that the claimed product as dictated by the claimed process limitations exhibits structural/chemical/mechanical/physical properties different from those of the product taught by Ishida.

Claim 3: See col. 8, lines 20-22.

Claims 3-6: See col. 12, lines 1-10.

Claim 7: See col. 11, lines 40-54.

Claims 8-10: See col. 12, lines 45-58.

Claims 11-12: See col. 3, lines 13-18.

Claims 13-14: See col. 12, lines 45-58 and col. 3, lines 13-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida et al (US 6,660,380) in view of Maeda et al (EP 0 824 132).*

Claim 1: Ishida et al teach a zinc oxide, the surface of which is coated with a metallic soap (see Ishida, col. 12, lines 1-10). Ishida does not teach the method of forming of the coating. Maeda et al disclose a method of forming a coating of a metallic soap on titanium dioxide by heating the mixture of the titanium dioxide and the metallic soap at 70 to 200 C (See Maeda, page 4, lines 25-28). The melting point of metallic soap is below 200C. Therefore, Maeda method involves heat-treating the metallic soap above its melting point to form a coating on titanium dioxide particles. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize that a method of coating metallic soap on titanium dioxide can also be used in coating application of metallic soap on zinc oxide because titanium dioxide and zinc oxide are both metal oxides and both share many common physical characteristics that they are both widely used in the art as inorganic pigments.

Claim 2: See Ishida col. 12, lines 1-10.

Claim 3: See Ishida, col. 8, lines 20-22.

Claims 3-6: See Ishida, col. 12, lines 1-10.

Claim 7: See Ishida, col. 11, lines 40-54.

Claims 8-10: See Ishida, col. 12, lines 45-58.

Claims 11-12: See Ishida, col. 3, lines 13-18.

Claims 13-14: See Ishida, col. 12, lines 45-58 and col. 3, lines 13-18.

5. References not relied upon are cited as art of interest.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1511. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

* Copy of this reference has been provided by Applicants.

Application/Control Number: 10/713,256
Art Unit: 1773

Page 5

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. T. Le'.

H. T. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773